

### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed May 11, 2009. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 and 3-12 are pending in this application, with Claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claims 1 and 3-11 have been amended, and Claims 2 and 13-24 have been canceled. No new matter is believed to have been added.

#### Examiner Interview

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Dager for the courtesy of extending a telephone interview on Wednesday, August 5, 2009. Examiner Dager was extremely professional and courteous, and exemplified the appropriate demeanor of a Patent Examiner. During the interview proposed amendments, identical to those presented herein, were discussed. It was agreed that these claim amendments distinguish over the art of record, but that additional search and consideration would be needed. As such, this amendment is being filed as the submission accompanying a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,355 (Gibbs et al.) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0124998 (Dame). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed and agreed to during the above-mentioned interview, neither Gibbs et al. nor Dame, either alone or in combination, disclose or remotely suggest at least a processor that is configured to determine if at least one textual air traffic control clearance message indicates the current flight plan should be modified to a modified aircraft flight plan, nor a display device configured to substantially simultaneously display one or more images representative of the current aircraft flight plan, the textual air traffic control clearance messages transmitted to the aircraft, and one or more images representative of the modified aircraft flight plan when at least one of the textual air traffic control clearance messages indicates the current flight plan should be modified. These features

are now recited in independent Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, and because Claims 3-12 depend from independent Claim 1, and further because independent Claims 23 and 24 have been canceled, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection is requested.

#### Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claim 1 is patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also deemed patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: August 10, 2009

By: /PAUL D. AMROZOWICZ/  
Paul D. Amrozowicz  
Reg. No. 45,264  
(480) 385-5060